



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,197	02/25/2004	Gregory W. Morton	06024-UPA	3689
56758	7590	01/31/2007		
KNOX PATENTS P.O. BOX 30034 KNOXVILLE, TN 37930-0034			EXAMINER NGHIEM, MICHAEL P	
			ART UNIT 2863	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/31/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/786,197	MORTON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Michael P. Nghiem	2863	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael P. Nghiem. (3)\_\_\_\_\_

(2) Thomas Kulaga. (4)\_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 29 January 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 66.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



**MICHAEL NGHIEM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argues that he replied to the claim objection by explaining that "paragraphs 163-165 discuss the STRUCTURES that performed the claimed functions and those structures appear on the drawing" (see Amendment filed on 10-23-2006). Examiner contends that Applicant's reply was not fully responsive because it did not answer the question the Examiner had in the claim objection: "are the means for processing, means for performing a cross-calibration, and means for recalibrating a deviating system related to the processor (126) (shown in Fig. 2)?" It appears that Applicant is claiming a plurality of structural limitations (mean plus function) where in fact there is only one structure (processor 126). If in fact there are more than one structure, then Applicant had failed to point out what/where the structures are. Paragraphs 163-165 seem to indicate that there is only one structure (i.e. processor 126) for supporting the means.